

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.

ps-

I want to add that I am stunned that such a ruckus could be made over the Super Bowl incident and Howard Stern, and yet when a slanted piece of propaganda is allowed to air in the hope of influencing an election and not even an eyebrow is raised over at the FCC? I find that shocking and insupportable. It doesn't seem to matter that Sinclair Broadcasting Group is a major contributor to the campaign to reelect George Bush. Well it should. The fact that John Kerry was invited to appear following the film only to subject himself to more baseless attacks is not an accommodation of any kind. I wonder what Michael Powell's "Standards" are for the sanctity of our election process. Is everything for sale, and is everything fine as long as it doesn't influence the continual conglomeration of the media? Puritanical standards for television viewing do not an integrity make. Is it merely self-interest at play here, self-preservation for a position held? Wake up and do the right thing.

-Scott Fincannon